UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/574,231	08/31/2006	Ulrike Schulz	P29301	2144
	7590 11/04/200 & BERNSTEIN, P.L.		EXAMINER	
	CLARKE PLACE		LEA, CHRISTOPHER RAYMOND	
KESTON, VA	20191		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1619	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			11/04/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

gbpatent@gbpatent.com pto@gbpatent.com

Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief

Application No.	Applicant(s)		
10/574,231	SCHULZ ET AL.		
Examiner	Art Unit		
Christopher R. Lea	1619		

	Christopher R. Lea	1619	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress
THE REPLY FILED <u>23 October 2009</u> FAILS TO PLACE THIS A	PPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR	R ALLOWANCE.	
1. The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on application, applicant must timely file one of the following rapplication in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Apple for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 C periods:	eplies: (1) an amendment, affidavir al (with appeal fee) in compliance	t, or other evidence, w with 37 CFR 41.31; or	hich places the (3) a Request
a) The period for reply expiresmonths from the mailing	date of the final rejection.		
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Adno event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire la Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (I	dvisory Action, or (2) the date set forth interthan SIX MONTHS from the mailing	date of the final rejection	n.
MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date of have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extruder 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the sist forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL	on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 ension and the corresponding amount of hortened statutory period for reply origi	of the fee. The appropria nally set in the final Offic	ate extension fee e action; or (2) as
2. ☐ The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compl	iance with 37 CFR 41 37 must be t	filed within two months	s of the date of
filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any exten Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed with AMENDMENTS	sion thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to	avoid dismissal of the	
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, b	out prior to the date of filing a brief.	will not be entered be	cause
(a) They raise new issues that would require further con	sideration and/or search (see NOT		
(b) They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below	·		
(c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in bett appeal; and/or	er form for appeal by materially red	ducing or simplifying th	ne issues for
(d) They present additional claims without canceling a c	orresponding number of finally reje	ected claims.	
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).			
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.12	1. See attached Notice of Non-Co	mpliant Amendment (I	PTOL-324).
5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):	See Continuation Sheet.		
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be all non-allowable claim(s).	·	•	_
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) [how the new or amended claims would be rejected is prov The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to: Claim(s) rejected: <u>34-57</u> . Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:		l be entered and an ex	xplanation of
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE			
 The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e). 			
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to or showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary	vercome <u>all</u> rejections under appea	l and/or appellant fails	s to provide a
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER	of the status of the claims after er	ntry is below or attach	ed.
The request for reconsideration has been considered but See Continuation Sheet.	does NOT place the application in	condition for allowan	ce because:
12. ☐ Note the attached Information <i>Disclosure Statement</i>(s). (13. ☐ Other:	PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)		
/YVONNE L. EYLER/	/C. R. L./		
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 1619	Examiner, Art Unit 1619		
	,		

Continuation of 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): Rejections of claims 42, 43, & 45 under 35 U.S.C. § 112, 2nd parargraph and of claims 34-57 under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(b) & 103(a) over Rubino.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments have been considered and are not persuasive. Applicant argues that Guskey does not teaches away from including water and doesn't teach water present in the ratios which result in gelling. The examiner points out that Guskey teaches water is preferably absent, which means formulations containing water are non-preferred embodiments, and non-preferred embodiments do not rise to the level of teaching away. Applicant also acknowledges that Guskey contains a gelling agent (note excluded by the "comprising" language, which means that any amount of water would sufficient to "result in gelling". Applicant also argues that the skilled artisan would not be motivated to combine an exfoliating agent and an antiperspirant agent. Applicant appears through this argument to reiterate that the skilled artisan would see no use in conditioning skin to which antiperspirant is applied and vice-versa. The examiner does not find this convincing, as exfoliating and antiperspirant agents could be applied to the same area of skin (antiperspirants, though usually applied to the armpit, do not find their sole use there) and combining agents for skin care in a composition also for skin care would have been prima facie obvious (See MPEP § 2144.06 I). For these reasons the rejection of claims 34-57 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as obvious over Guskey et al. is maintained.